## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO, : APPEAL NO. C-080062

TRIAL NO. B-0701513B

Plaintiff-Appellee, :

JUDGMENT ENTRY.

vs. :

ROBERT SNEED, :

Defendant-Appellant. :

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court.<sup>1</sup>

Defendant-appellant Robert Sneed was indicted for aggravated murder, murder, and aggravated robbery. All counts carried firearm specifications. Under a plea agreement, Sneed pleaded guilty to involuntary manslaughter with a firearm specification and tampering with evidence. An agreed aggregate sentence of 15 years' incarceration was imposed.

Pursuant to *Anders v. California*,<sup>2</sup> Sneed's counsel advises this court that, after a thorough review of the record, she has discerned no arguable assignments of error to present on appeal. Counsel has filed a motion to withdraw. She now asks this court to conduct an independent review of the record to determine whether the proceedings in the trial court were free from prejudicial error.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 3(A), App.R. 11.1(E), and Loc.R. 12.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> (1967), 386 U.S. 738, 87 S.Ct. 1396.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Freels v. Hills (C.A.6, 1988), 843 F.2d 958.

## OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

After reviewing the entire record, we are satisfied that Sneed's counsel has provided him with a diligent and thorough search of the record, and that counsel has correctly concluded that the proceedings below were free from prejudicial error.<sup>4</sup> We therefore overrule counsel's motion to withdraw from her representation of Sneed and affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Our determination that the proceedings below were free of prejudicial error compels our conclusion that there are no reasonable grounds for this appeal. But because Sneed is indigent, we refrain from taxing costs and expenses against him.

A certified copy of this judgment entry shall constitute the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

SUNDERMANN, P.J., HILDEBRANDT and CUNNINGHAM, JJ.

*To the Clerk:* 

Enter upon the Journal of the Court on October 22, 2008

per order of the Court \_\_\_\_\_\_.

Presiding Judge

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Penson v. Ohio (1988), 488 U.S. 75, 109 S.Ct. 346.